

A Symposium on Central European Jews

At its Convention in December 1969, the American Historical Association held a Symposium on The Cultural and Economic Rôle of the Jews in Central Europe with Professor R. John Rath of Rice University in the chair. The aim was to clarify, and comment on, the situation of the Jews in the Weimar Republic of Germany and in the last stage of the Habsburg Empire. This is, of course, a subject on which the studies of the Leo Baeck Institute are focused. The fact that a section of this great American Association of scholars submitted it to close scrutiny shows that the development of the Jewish problem during a comparatively liberal period in Central Europe, on the eve of disaster, is accepted as a matter of general historical significance. Its impact widely transcends the narrow limits of the special case or of purely Jewish relevancy. Not only have some of the outstanding figures produced by the cultural integration of Jews in Central Europe left their mark on the thought of the century, but the very problem of integrating a minority, with its own characteristic features, into a society from which they had been separated for centuries, with all the resulting consequences — both positive and negative — is a matter of great general psychological and sociological interest, not only to historians.

We are grateful to the participants of this American discussion for permission to print their papers in this Year Book. Nothing essential has been changed in the original texts nor has the editor interfered with the spontaneity of the speeches, so as to preserve the actual character of the event. We have also avoided criticism or comment on some of the more controversial points. The intention here is to let our readers know how the speakers of that Conference, all well-versed students of the material, look at these problems so close to ourselves. As to our own position, readers of the fifteen volumes of this Year Book and of other publications of the Leo Baeck Institute may be familiar with it. We consider that one single study could hardly do justice to a subject of such vastness and complexity, which requires detailed research. The two volumes which the Leo Baeck Institute has published deal with the situation at two particularly critical moments of the Weimar Republic, 1916-1923* and 1932**, and place the Weimar era in the context of German history as a whole. But we agree with Professor Sauer that one more concise and unitary survey of the subject would be desirable and particularly valuable to those readers for whom the whole Weimar epoch is gradually receding into a legendary and hazy past. Meanwhile, it will be noticed that publications of the Leo Baeck Institute are frequently quoted by the speakers. Some pertinent remarks in the general introduction to this volume refer to this fact.

We believe, however, that members of the Leo Baeck Institute and readers of the Year Book will be greatly interested to learn the views of some American historians and their approach to a problem which is of special concern to the work of the Institute.

**Deutsches Judentum in Krieg und Revolution 1916-1923*. Ein Sammelband herausgegeben von Werner E. Mosse unter Mitwirkung von Arnold Paucker, Tübingen 1971 (Schriftenreihe wissenschaftlicher Abhandlungen des Leo Baeck Instituts 25).

***Entscheidungsjahr 1932. Zur Judenfrage in der Endphase der Weimarer Republik*. Ein Sammelband herausgegeben von Werner E. Mosse unter Mitwirkung von Arnold Paucker, Tübingen 1965, 1966 (Schriftenreihe wissenschaftlicher Abhandlungen des Leo Baeck Instituts 13).

The Jews in the Habsburg Empire, 1879-1918

BY WILLIAM A. JENKS

In a recent essay on Richard Wagner's interpretation of the rôle of the Jews in the nineteenth century, the British theatre critic and television personality Bryan Magee offers a stimulating theory to explain the explosion of talent and great accomplishments that marked the first century of Jewish emancipation in Europe. First, he is sure that the "intellectual and artistic output of Jews in this century relative to their numbers is a phenomenon for which I can think of no parallel in history since Athens five centuries before Christ". Why? Not because they were "chosen" to be "masters," an idea he deems "superstitious, obviously false, and nasty", but because they were integrating with a Western cultural tradition that was disintegrating to meet them half-way. The Jew who had recently come from the ghetto or who knew of his parents' life there was likely to be more emotionally involved in and better prepared to articulate the deepest concerns of the age in which he lived. Rootlessness, alienation, and adjustment were not novelties for him, and so he became the archetypal modern man. At the cost of renouncing what Magee calls "that most tribal, observance-ridden and past-oriented of religions", the greatest of the Jews — Marx, Freud, and Einstein — "have produced theories about man and his environment which in depth, originality and scope are equal to almost any before them".¹

I should like to suggest that the atomization of society and the individual's loneliness and vulnerability therein also help to explain the rise of the great Jewish capitalists. The man whose ancestors weathered the uncertainties of money-lending, door-to-door selling, and personal insecurity was likely to comport himself with coolness and toughness when panics, tariffs, or switches in governmental favours menaced his holdings. He had to be a "matador of the Bourse", to use one of the antisemitic phrases of the day that paid unconscious tribute to the grim laws of economic survival.

Indubitably the outstanding Jewish contributions to Austro-Hungarian culture and material prosperity came from those who were neutral about their faith, officially *konfessionslos*, or converts to Protestantism or Catholicism.² The question of

¹Bryan Magee, *Aspects of Wagner*, New York 1969, pp. 39-50.

²For the Jews of Austria, the best bibliography is the one prepared by Ilse R. Wolff in Josef Fraenkel, (ed.), *The Jews of Austria*, London 1967, pp. 547-566. For Hungary, one must still rely on Klaus Schickert, *Die Judenfrage in Ungarn*, Berlin, Essen, Leipzig 1937, pp. 183-189, and on the suggestions made by P. Hanák, 'Skizzen über die ungarische Gesellschaft am Anfang des 20. Jahrhunderts', in *Acta Historica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, X, 1963, No. 1-2, pp. 42-45. In order to ascertain which persons were of Jewish descent the reader is referred to the following works: Julius von Farkas, *Der Freiheitskampf des ungarischen Geistes 1867-1914*, Berlin 1940; Hans Tietze, *Die Juden Wiens*, Leipzig and Vienna 1933; Saul Raphael Landau, *Der Polenklub und seine Hausjuden*, Vienna 1907; Max Grunwald, *Geschichte der Wiener Juden bis 1914*, Vienna 1925;

classification obviously is difficult and can be tendentious. Several examples should suffice. What of Vilmos Fraknói, born Frankel, who became a Catholic priest at twenty-two, eventually the titular bishop of Arbe (Rab), and respected by Leo XIII and the Hungarian public for his historical studies of Pázmány, Hunyadi, and the liberation from the Turks? Or of Tobias Ludwig Österreichher, who renounced Judaism at twenty-five, served with distinction in the navy, especially in the geodetic survey of the Adriatic coasts, and retired as *Conteradmiral* in 1882?³ That either of them consciously felt close to his heritage is questionable, but a recent comment on Gustav Mahler is apposite. Henry-Louis de la Grange projects a “definitive biography” of the composer by 1970, and he already has recorded the participation of Mahler’s father in Jewish communal life in Iglau and his son’s regular attendance at the synagogue. He concludes that his subject “did not practise Catholicism to any greater extent than he had practised the religion of his fathers, but there is no doubt that his orthodox Jewish education exercised a considerable influence on his character”.⁴ Solid biographical studies of others who deserted the synagogue would probably lead to similar conclusions.

Prior to 1867 Jewish individuals and families in the Habsburg dominions made their more significant contributions in the economic sphere. The Rothschilds were the best known of the entrepreneurs, shoring up the state’s finances when deficits regularly appeared, securing the funds needed for the great railway lines, and establishing the banks needed for the expansion of industry, commerce, and mining. After 1879 the influence of the great families diminished only in the field of rail transportation, where the state assumed control of all important lines save, temporarily, the *Nordbahn*. To meet the cost of occupying Bosnia-Herzegovina, the Rothschild consortium in Vienna disposed of six per cent state obligations on the world’s money markets.⁵ Wilhelm Guttman, the “coal king”, collaborated with the same family in exploiting the Moravian-Silesian coal-fields,⁶ and the Jewish production of textiles in Brünn and of sugar in Bohemia was a commonplace of political and economic discussions. The great houses of the Todesco, Schey, Königswarter, and Springer clans along the Ringstraße emphasised the great importance of the Viennese Jews in leather goods, furniture, ready-to-wear clothing, beer, and food processing. Today the name Gerngross reminds visitors of the techniques developed decades ago to place a variety of goods under one roof of a department store.

In Hungary the railway lines and textile factories were the creations of Viennese

Aurelia Gerlach, *Der Einfluss der Juden in der österreichischen Sozialdemokratie*, Vienna and Leipzig 1939; Robert Körber, *Rassesieg in Wien*, Vienna 1939. As some of these were published under the Nazi regime they must be consulted with extreme caution, and all should be checked against S. Wininger, *Große Jüdische National-Biographie*, 7 vols., Czernowitz 1925-1936 which also, however, in a few instances, makes erroneous attributions.

³Unless otherwise noted, biographical material has been taken from Wininger’s alphabetized entries.

⁴*Saturday Review*, 29th March 1969, pp. 47-48.

⁵Heinrich Benedikt, *Die wirtschaftliche Entwicklung in der Franz-Joseph-Zeit*, Vienna and Munich 1958, p. 110.

⁶Erich Zöllner, *Geschichte Österreichs*, Vienna 1961, p. 448.

finance, but it was not long before Jewish families of Budapest, whether of recent or distant provenance, moved from flour-milling into leather goods, distilleries, presses, banks, coal-mines, and railway carriage construction. The oligarchy which dominated the Bourse and the grain sales in the capital usually founded its fortunes in the production of flour, and such names as Weiss, Wolfner, Deutsch, Ullman, Brüll, and Herzog might become Magyarized when a second or third generation dabbled in chauvinism or mere *belles-lettres*.⁷ Thanks to their early experience as tradesmen in grain, the prosperous millers tended to buy or lease farmland to an extent rivalled in Austria only by some sugar magnates. The truly spectacular career was that of Manfred Weiss. Born in 1857, he created an industrial complex on Csepel Island in the 1880s to turn out impressive quantities of the cartridges, rifles, and munitions that the Austro-Hungarian army would practise with and then use in 1914-1918. His many other interests included textiles, the shipping industry at Fiume, the presidency of the Pest Hungarian Commercial Bank, and membership in the House of Magnates. Fifty great families, the majority Jewish by origin, dominated Hungarian industry, banking, and, in reality, the marketing of agricultural commodities. Thanks to their ties with Vienna and Germany, they were a most necessary part of Hungarian society, a fact realized by the magnates rather than by the gentry and peasantry.⁸

Closely allied to the world of business was that of politics and the press. With the advent of Dualism and true emancipation, the Jews of both realms at first gravitated to liberal parties which stressed basic civil rights and minimal governmental interference in economic affairs. In the 1870s Julius Glaser and Josef Unger were Austrian cabinet members, and in the 1880s Emil Steinbach, symbolizing intellectual discontent with *laissez-faire*, prepared the social legislation of the Taafe era. A decade later Rudolf Sieghart was accomplishing wonders for prime ministers in the Austrian parliament by cajoling and threatening obstructionist deputies into voting "the right way". It was widely noted in the re-negotiations of the economic *Ausgleich* in 1907 that he, born Singer, was the chief Austrian bargainer, while József Sztérényi, the son of a rabbi, represented the Hungarian point of view.⁹ Persons of Jewish background who served in both parliaments did not tend to embrace Jewish nationalism until the empire's last decade, and then really only in Austria. A Rudolf Auspitz, factory owner and doctrinaire liberal, might sit in the same chamber with an Alois Zucker of the Czech Club and a Rafael Luzatto of Trieste. Four or five nearly always helped to represent Galicia, and their demonstrated loyalty to the Polish Club was comparable to the tendency of the Jews of Vienna and Prague to opt for German culture, to the rapid Magyarization of the Jews of Budapest, and the Jewish affinity with Italian culture in Trieste. After 1900 a specifically Jewish National Party sent a few deputies to the *Reichsrat*, but their

⁷V. Sándor, 'Die Entfaltung der Großmühlenindustrie in Budapest nach dem Ausgleich i. 1867', in *Acta Historica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, X, 1964, pp. 264-265.

⁸Hanák, *loc. cit.*, p. 11. See also Nathaniel Katzburg, 'Hungarian Jewry in Modern Times', in Randolph L. Braham, ed., *Hungarian-Jewish Studies*, New York 1966, pp. 144-146.

⁹For Rudolf Sieghart's opinion of Sztérényi, see his *Die letzten Jahrzehnte einer Großmacht*, Berlin 1932, p. 110.

inability to shake the cultural allegiances of their co-religionists was all too apparent in the elections of 1907 and 1911.

In Hungary outstanding Jewish physicians, businessmen, journalists, and jurists sat in parliament as part of the Liberal machine perfected by the Tiszas or, less often, with the Party of Independence. In either case their adherence to Hungary's social and national policy was undeniable, and a watch-maker turned Agrarian Socialist like Vilmos Mezőfi was very much an anomaly in the Lower House.

In both realms the emergence of Marxian Socialist parties complicated the general tendency of the Jews to blend with an historic nationality (the Czech excepted). Among the founding fathers in Austria were Victor Adler of prosperous middle-class origin, the ex-clerk Friedrich Austerlitz, who taught himself the intricacies of law and literature, and Ignacy Daszyński, the son of a minor Galician district official who organised over ninety of the first Polish trade unions. In Hungary some of the earliest Marxian activists were Jakob Schlesinger and Leo Frankel, and among the leaders who still were battling without much success against "the system" in Hungary after 1900 were Miksa Grossmann, stalwart of the Butchers' Union, Jakab Kardos (born Israel), the ex-tinsmith, and Zsigmond Kunfi, pedagogue and journalist.¹⁰ In the German-Austrian, Polish-Austrian, and Magyar branches of Social Democracy then, persons of Jewish ancestry who almost always had become estranged from their faith were prominent. In the Czech branch this was not the case, since the Jews of Bohemia and Moravia tended to espouse German cultural patterns.¹¹

Direct involvement in parliamentary affairs of the Jewish community and its often agnostic sons paled in comparison with their involvement in press affairs. Who has not read of the Hungarian Christian-Social paper, edited by a one-time Jew? If the story is unprovable, it at least lies in the sphere of probability. The *Neue Freie Presse* and the *Pester Lloyd* were two of Europe's best journals, though such powerful editors as Moritz Benedikt, Miksa Falk, and Leo Veigelsberg enraged readers who did not equate happiness with liberalism and the steady growth of the gross imperial product. It was no surprise, consequently, to find Austerlitz editing the *Arbeiter-Zeitung* and Kunfi active on *Népszava*. Possibly the best known of Viennese publishing tycoons was Moritz Szeps, the Crown Prince's friend, and certainly Vienna's best-known gadfly was Karl Kraus. Whether one wanted the discreet official line, cabaret-type satires on the foibles of the mighty, or dogged analyses of society's ills, the Viennese press obliged, and its owners and writers were overwhelmingly Jewish.¹² In Budapest there was need for more editorial discretion, but

¹⁰See G. D. H. Cole, *A History of Socialist Thought*, vol. III, Part II. — *The Second International 1889-1914*, London 1956, pp. 575-576, 584-585, and Tibor Süle, *Sozialdemokratie in Ungarn. Zur Rolle der Intelligenz in der Arbeiterbewegung 1899-1910*, Cologne and Graz 1967.

¹¹For a general picture of the Jews in Bohemia and Moravia, see Ruth Kestenbergl-Gladstein, 'The Jews between Czechs and Germans in the Historic Lands, 1848-1918', in *The Jews of Czechoslovakia*, Philadelphia and New York 1968, and Ernst Wodak, *Prag von Gestern und Morgen*, Tel Aviv 1948.

¹²See Richard Grunberger, 'Jews in Austrian Journalism', in *The Jews of Austria*, pp. 83-95, and J. W. Nagl, Jakob Zeidler, and Eduard Castle, *Deutsch-Österreichische Literaturgeschichte*, vol. III, Vienna 1930, pp. 867-904.

the picture was much the same.¹³ In Prague the German-oriented *Bohemia* had a series of Jewish editors, but organs of Czech nationalism looked elsewhere. The chance to write *feuilletons* and to criticize music and literature furthered the careers of many of Jewish background. Eduard Hanslick and Julius Korngold are still worth reading, even if the former offered an over-supply of unfortunate verdicts. Geza Molnár did much the same for the *Pester Lloyd*, exemplifying with his *Theory of Hungarian Music* (1903) the Budapest Jewish community's tendency to further the march of Magyar pride. Theodor Herzl, Anton Deutsch, Alexander Bródy, Felix Salten, and dozens more — in political reporting, economic analysis, naturalistic short stories or discriminating pen pictures of the era, made a substantial contribution in educating and entertaining the literate public.

Politics and press had the law as their solid underpinning, and here, too, in commentaries and in exposition legal scholars of Jewish origin made their mark. Julius Glaser struck a great blow for civil rights when his ideas triumphed in a new code of civil procedure for Austria. Josef Unger was the great analyst of the civil law, and the two, through lectures and casebooks, educated several generations of students. A galaxy of jurisconsults wrote expertly on property, marriage, labour relations, patents, military law, and even canon law. As is quite well known, a sizeable percentage of law students were Jewish, and their contribution to strengthening the rule of law is likewise worth mentioning.¹⁴ In Hungary Károly Csemegi and László Fayer redrew the criminal code, while Anton Almasi was the great codifier in the field of civil law. Emancipation was not simply the opportunity to move into all of society's activities. The unending struggle to secure the law and to expand its benefits likewise attracted hundreds.

Medicine as well was a lure for the altruistic, the ambitious, and the scientifically curious. Victor Adler was the "poor man's doctor" before turning wholly to radical politics, as was Wilhelm Ellenbogen. Arthur Schnitzler worked at laryngology for a while, but medicine was no half-way station for dozens of others who held posts at the universities and treated every kind of ailment in their clinics. Sigmund Freud's work made a tremendous impact on the generation that survived World War I, and Alfred Adler's breach with the master in 1911 merely exposed the richness of the field Freud had opened up. In more orthodox fields, Emil Zuckerkandl used wit and sarcasm to illuminate anatomy, Adam Politzer and Henrik Neuman eased the frustrations of the deaf, Moritz Kaposi laboured to heal the afflictions of the skin, and Julius Mauthner's research on cholesterine afforded our generation a never-ending topic for debate. In every field — embryology, internal medicine, radiology, neurology — there were masters to instruct the students in Vienna, Prague, and Budapest. Even a bustling textile town like Brünn could boast later that Siegmund Kornfeld had lectured regularly on anatomy at the *Technische Hochschule* before

¹³For example, such editors as József Vészi on the *Pesti Napló*, József Csukássy of the *Pesti Hírlap* (until he founded, with Eugen Rákosi, the *Budapesti Hírlap*) Menyhert Palagyi of *Új Nemzedék*, and Emil Makai of *A Hét*. Outstanding publishers were Singer & Wolfner and Mór Révai.

¹⁴See Franz Kobler, 'The Contribution of Austrian Jews to Jurisprudence', in *The Jews of Austria*, pp. 25-40.

embarking upon psychiatry in Vienna. The great reputation for medical training which the capital enjoyed owed much to the brilliant teachers and clinicians of Jewish ancestry.¹⁵

From rostrum and printed page other scholars added to the empire's cultural wealth. If a Theodor Gomperz conveyed the serenity of the classical world while his brothers played leading rôles in Brunn's and Vienna's moneyed circles,¹⁶ other specialists were likely to identify themselves with a dominant national culture. Heinrich Friedjung was the prize example of German Austrian patriotism, while Henrik Marczali, Ignác Acsádi, and Ármin Vámbéry dug deep into the Magyar past. If a Ludwig Gumpłowicz at Graz attempted to discern the emergence of "the state" through *Rassenkampf*, his son Maximilian, trained in history at Lvov, laboured on early medieval Polish texts at the University of Vienna. The most striking example of scholarship turned to ethnocentric considerations was Zsigmond Simonyi's search for the origins of Magyar when he was a professor at the University of Budapest.

In literature the emancipated generation was quite active and impressive. *Liliom* seems picturesque, even bland, when compared with the polemical broadsides of our time, and *The Guardsman* calls for Thespian finesse of a high order if it is to work. But who, better than Ferenc Molnár, acquainted the rest of the West with the empire's creative impulses? Possibly Schnitzler in Vienna, who was concerned in his writings with the problems of conversion to Christianity and who debated in private with Herzl the future of the Jews.¹⁷ Both pointed to the ugliness and stupidity that marred their period in time, but it was their fate to suffer audiences and critics who chose to look for sentiment and the purely bitter-sweet in their creations. A host of less famous figures in the two capitals involved themselves in every facet of literary life. Peter Altenberg was the rebel against hypocritical convention, Alexander Bródy preached naturalism, Karl Kraus was the eternal moralist, and Ignotus (Hugo Veigelsberg) led yet another "Young Hungary". In sociological discourses, essays on aesthetics, literary debates, and satirical squibs there was a thorough ventilation of man's faults when he governed, and his errors when he described his condition.¹⁸ Standing in the wings, heirs to such adventurousness and imagination, were young men of the calibre of Franz Kafka, Stefan Zweig, Franz Werfel, and Egon Friedell.

In music Mahler helped bring to a close the great romantic tradition, and Arnold Schönberg inaugurated the freedoms that preceded our electronic and aleatory experimentation. Could any other statement better encapsulate the ability of the first truly free generation to master the accepted canons and yet strike out in a

¹⁵See Moshe Atlas, 'Großjüdische Ärzte Wiens im neunzehnten und zwanzigsten Jahrhundert', *ibid.*, pp. 41-65.

¹⁶On these brothers, see *Österreichisches Biographisches Lexikon 1815-1950*, 6. Lieferung, Graz and Cologne 1957, pp. 31-32.

¹⁷Harry Zohn, 'Three Austrian Jews in German Literature: Schnitzler, Zweig, Herzl', in *The Jews of Austria*, pp. 69-71.

¹⁸For this period in Hungary, see Zoltán Horváth, *Die Jahrhundertwende in Ungarn. Geschichte der zweiten Reformgeneration 1896-1914*, Budapest 1966.

masterfully original manner? The same cannot be said for Imre Kálmán's charming but superficial operettas and Hermann Rosenzweig's fiery gipsy music. But musicologists like Guido Adler and Egon Wellesz, a publisher like Emil Hertzka, conductors like Bruno Walter and Arthur Bodanzky, even singers like Selma Kurz and Leopold Demuth attested to the general involvement in the musical life of Vienna, Budapest, and Prague.

Jewish contributions to painting, sculpture, and architecture were surprisingly meagre. A Philippe de László made a great reputation as a portraitist in England, but no one in the empire rivalled Pissarro, Modigliani, or Soutine.¹⁹ Viennese society might seethe over the designs offered by Otto Wagner, Olbrich, and Josef Hoffmann, but antisemitism could not be invoked.

An appreciation of Jewish contributions to Austro-Hungarian culture and life requires caveats, of course. In all the fields covered above, non-Jews also played their part. One near-exception was psychiatry, where Freud's unorthodoxies, rivalled only by Schönberg's in originality and shock-value among the creations emanating from the Jewish community, seemed to inhibit or repel the traditional Christian man of medicine. A second field in which non-Jews had but a supporting rôle was journalism, for the rise of Catholic-Conservative, Catholic-Social, and antisemitic papers did not seriously threaten the prestige and the profits of the older dailies.

But industrialism owed a great debt to an Alexander Schoeller and other Gentile industrialists and artisans from what eventually would be the German Empire. In political life the members of cabinets and parliaments were substantially of long-established Catholic and Protestant families. As for Jewish influence in Liberal and Marxian political circles, it is next to impossible to decide where the emancipated generation had its greater influence. Within Social Democracy the incidence of Jews as leaders was high, but who can say that this fact was more decisive than the influence of moneyed circles in Vienna, Budapest, Prague, and Brünn upon Liberal policies? Whatever the verdict, one must remember the masses of non-Jewish workers and intellectuals who voted the Socialist way and the marked non-Jewish control of Liberal electoral and parliamentary strategy. In law, medicine, literature, and music the Jewish contributions were great, but not monopolistic. Richard Strauss had the lead on Mahler in 1914, to give an obvious example.

Another serious challenge to a proper appreciation of the Jewish contribution lies in the still under-explored field of economic history. The Nazis were able to ascertain and put on record all the Rothschild holdings in Austria in the 1930s, but the full extent of the famous house's influence during Dualism is known only in general outline. No one is unaware of the need of a history of the Mauthner family, of the Deutsch-Hatvany family, of all the great Jewish families, but who is hopeful that many of the records have survived? Also, one must face the fact that the spread of capitalism and the building up of great fortunes has not always seemed to all

¹⁹A conclusion arrived at from reading Karl Schwarz, *Jewish Artists of the 19th and 20th Centuries*, New York 1949.

observers to be in the general interest. Eduard März has made serious charges about the selfishness of the great banks in his theory that they impeded the flow of capital to areas ready for take-off.²⁰ Here, of course, an entire hierarchy of economic power is on trial, with accused and accusers from the Jewish and non-Jewish communities.

The many controversialists who denounced the Germans, Magyars, and Poles for their condescension towards, and sometimes repression of, other nationalities, have not spared the Jews some of their reproaches. The attitude of the self-sufficient Jewish burgher of Vienna and Prague was nearly always pro-German, certainly in the cultural sense. In Galicia there was a tendency not to oppose Polish predominance over Ruthenes and Jews alike until Landau and Benno Straucher raised the banner of Jewish nationalism. Without the brains, the wealth, the actual numbers of the Jews in Hungary, could Magyarization have been as effective as it was? Czechs, Ruthenes, South Slavs, and Rumanians resented the Jewish collaboration with those most responsible for Jewish emancipation, and the participation of Jewish intellectuals in Social Democratic plans for appeasing national bitterness meant little to them. In short, should one call the Jews of the empire a centripetal force, and question of questions, was this a bad thing?

Finally, there is the problem of creative originality in Franz Joseph's Dual Monarchy. In medicine research was undoubtedly first-rate. In operetta and gipsy music there was an atmospheric note rarely duplicated elsewhere. But in other fields there was a tendency to follow, to copy. Naturalism, symbolism, expressionism, art for art's sake — the phrases and the creations seemed more at home in Paris, London, and Berlin. Nevertheless, Freud and Schönberg profoundly influenced man's thinking. Like practically all persons of the emancipated generation, their loyalty to traditional Judaism was tepid. Freed of the constraints that prejudice and inwardness had forged, they epitomized in their works a consciousness of a dissolving society and its ills. Hundreds from the Jewish community made their contribution to the empire's last years. These two simply represent the best that was offered, and their best was rivalled but not surpassed by anyone else in the Western world.

²⁰Eduard März, 'Besonderheiten in der Entwicklung des österreichischen Bankwesens', in *Schmollers Jahrbuch für Gesetzgebung, Verwaltung und Volkswirtschaft*, 77, 1957, No. 2, pp. 62-70.